DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 289 228 EA 019 738

AUTHOR Beck, John J.
TITLE Profile of the Principalship. A Study of Principals' Perceptions.
PUB DATE Jun 87
NOTE 73p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Education; Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Employment Experience; *Employment Potential; Instructional Leadership; *Job Skills; Occupational Surveys; *Principals; Professional Development; *Program Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed 1,000 elementary, junior high/middle school, and high school principals in Texas by questionnaire to gather their perceptions on issues related to the principalship. The following four issues were explored: (1) source of expertise; (2) skills necessary to the success of any principal; (3) level of expertise of the respondents in each of the identified skills; and (4) adequacy of preparation received in each of the respondents' university programs in educational administration. Findings indicate that on-the-job experience and common sense were the most important sources of expertise, whereas university preparation programs and experiences gained outside of education were the least important sources. Campus leadership, instructional leadership, and interpersonal relations are the skills perceived to be of most importance to success. Curriculum development, physical plant management, and budgeting and finance skills were seen as being of least importance to success. Principals perceived that level of expertise closely matched the perceived necessity of the skill, but the expertise was seen to have been obtained from sources other than their university preparation program in educational administration. A 20-item bibliography and 8 appendices of survey instruments and data comprise one-half of the report. (Author/CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED289228

PROFILE OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP
A STUDY OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS

by

John J. Beck, Ph.D.

Department of Educational Administration and
Psychological Services
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John J. Beck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

June, 1987

EA 019 738

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROFILE OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP
A STUDY OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS

by

John J. Beck, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Educational Administration
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666
June, 1987

Abstract

1,000 elementary, junior high/middle school, and high school principals were surveyed via questionnaire to gather their perceptions on four issues related to the principalship: 1) source of expertise, 2) skills necessary to the success of any principal, 3) level of expertise of the respondents in each of the identified skills, and 4) adequacy of preparation received in the respondents' university preparation program in educational administration. Findings indicated that on-the-job experience and common sense were the most important sources of expertise while university prepration programs and experiences gained outside of education were the least important sources. Campus leadership, instructional leadership, and interpersonal relations were found to be the skills perceived to be of most importance to success while curriculum development, physical plant management, and budgeting and finance skills were seen to be of least importance. Principals perceived level of expertise closely matched the perceived necessity of the skill, but the expertise was seen to have been obtained from sources other than their university preparation program in educational administration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Review of Literature---------- 1

Method---------- 5

Results---------- 6
- Analysis of Total Sample---------- 6
- Descriptive Statistics for Total Sample---------- 7
- Significant Relations Among Demographic Variables--------14
- Significant Relations Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceptions of Sources of Competence to Succeed as a Building Principal----------19
- Significant Relations Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Importance of Selected Skills to the Success of Any Principal----------20
- Significant Relations Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Level of Expertise in the Selected Skill Areas----------22
- Significant Relations Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Level of Preparation Received in Their University Educational Administration Program----------25
- Open-Ended Responses----------27

Conclusions----------29

Bibliography----------35

Appendices
- A: Questionnaire Cover Letter----------37
- B: Questionnaire----------38
- C: Tabulation of Frequency of Response and Per Cent Response by Categorical Value for Six Independent Variables----------40
- D: Tables of Relationships Between Pairs of Demographic Variables----------42
- E: Tables of Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceptions of Sources of Competence to Succeed as a Building Principal------53
- F: Tables of Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Importance of Selected Skills to the Success of Any Principal----55
- G: Tables of Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Expertise in Selected Skills----------58
- H: Tables of Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceptions of Their University Educational Administration Programs--------66

PROFILE OF THE PRINCIPALSHIP

A STUDY OF PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS

America's schools have been the subject of close scrutiny in recent years, and it is likely that this attention will continue. Education is now, more than ever before, a popular topic for discussion at all levels, from national to local. The major result of this attention, brought about by a deep-rooted concern about the effectiveness of America's schools, is a refocusing in the '80s on the schools as a knowledge institution (Thomson, 1986). School principals are an integral part of this change in America's values concerning what a school ought to be.

The principalship continues to be the "hot corner" in the educational enterprise, and it is a central issue in current discussions on effective schools. Most of the recent national education reports highlight the role of the principal in promoting excellence. The perception is that the building principal is in a pivotal position to effect school improvement (Dianda, 1984). This "Great Principal" notion is inferred, for the most part, from case studies of inner-city elementary schools in which these principals express a schoolwide emphasis on basic skills achievement, set high expectations for students and teachers, and impart a belief in a vision of what might be (Gersten and others, 1982).

Skeptics of the "Great Principal" notion argue that it is naive to think that principals, not all of whom were effective

teachers, can either acquire or maintain a higher level of teaching expertise than the teachers they supervise (Goodlad, 1983). Furthermore, non-instructional chores consume a major proportion of the principal's day; many teachers do not welcome an "intrusive" principal; and many principals cannot balance leadership responsibilities with teachers' need for instructional autonomy, a key ingredient in many successful schools (Wolcott, 1973; Howell, 1981). Joyce (1986) argued that many school administrators are oriented toward logistics and community relations rather than instructional leadership.

A significant factor which bears upon the principal's perceived inability to effect critical change in any function of the organization called school is the set of perceptions about the principal's role. Wolcott (1973) argued that the traditions that have traced the principalship have only served to burden and hamper the principal's effectiveness. He said that since principals are hired to serve their institutions and their societies as monitors for continuity, it is ironic and unfortunate that school administrators are heralded as agents of change and unreasonable to expect them to be such agents. Another important factor which belies the "Great Principal" notion is the reward system imposed on principals by superintendents and boards of education. Until very recently, principals tended to be hired for their "non-boat-rocking" qualities rather than their intelligence, creativity, or courage (Gibboney, 1987). Allison (1983) argued that rather than create orders, principals much prefer to take and to give them; that

schools are like the military in that conformity to rules and regulations is a major virtue; and that among whatever qualities a principal may have, being outspoken or independent is not among them.

Just as the nature and effectiveness of the principal's role is controversial, so is the nature and effectiveness of education programs for principals. Gibboney (1987) offered the opinion that those least likely to offer critical insights into educational issues are those educated in school law, budgets, personnel, and public relations. He argued for an education for administrators rooted in the "fundamental enlightenment of thought" as opposed to the simple acquisition of skills. Conversely, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) defines the primary goal of training for administrators to be increased competence which, in turn, is defined as "a synonym for specific skill performance" (NASSP Special Report, 1985).

On the one hand, one camp argues for skills acquisition through techniques such as cooperative assessment centers as defined and illustrated in the NASSP report. On the other hand, a second camp argues for something beyond skills acquisition. Cawelti (1982) argued for general improvement of university preparation programs with an emphasis on human resources development. Wollcott (1973) saw the purpose of administrator programs to be helping school administrators better understand the social processes in which they are engaged. Gibboney (1987) would have administrators study content from philosophy, history,

social science, and the classic works in education rather than what he referred to as "trivial courses in management and administration that have been taught for several decades."

The problems of role preparation, role definition, and role specifications are further complicated because of the limited amount of research on formal training or preparation of school principals. Little is known, for example, about the relative effectiveness of one process over another. In fact, the limited research on the effect of training in the form of graduate study seems to suggest that a negative relationship may exist between one's perceived effectiveness and the number of credits of graduate study. While one may reason that what one learns prior to job entry has an impact on performance, the role context of the work environment may be much more important in determining the behavior of a principal (Greenfield, 1982, 1985).

The literature reporting practicing principals' perceptions of the value of various types of preparation and experience also is mixed. Hoyle (1985) found little evidence to connect administrator preparation with either work patterns or effectiveness of the administrator. In a study of elementary principals (Pharis and Zakariya, 1979) found that 36% of their sample reported their graduate education to be of much value while only 6% found it to be of little value. The elementary principals reported, however, that their experience as a teacher and their on-the-job training were both of greater value than their graduate preparation. Thus, principals are more likely to get ideas for innovation from other principals and teachers than

from college courses. Similarly, in a study of 65 elementary principals in the same district (Trider, Leithwood, and Montgomery, 1985), it was found that principals' professional experiences, beliefs, and values appeared, to a large measure, to determine what they did on the job. Page and Page (1984) found that principals perceived that they had received adequate graduate instruction in school plant, observation of instruction, compliance with governance guidelines, evaluation of self, and evaluation of teachers. They perceived inadequate instruction in administration of the lunch program, pupil transportation, leadership of non-teaching staff, purchasing, extra-curricular activities, board relations, and parental realtions.

Method

The major purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of principals in Texas regarding the source and level of expertise of their knowledge and leadership skills. To achieve this purpose, the following questions were investigated:

1. What are principals' perceived sources of their competence?
2. What are principals' perceived relative importance of selected responsibilities?
3. What are principals' perceived level of expertise in selected responsibilities?
4. What are principals' perceived level of satisfaction in their university educational administration program?

To investigate these questions, 1000 school principals in Texas, representing 17 per cent of the 5,892 principals in the

State, were randomly selected to participate in the study. A stratified random sampling procedure was used to insure proportionate distribution across elementary, middle school/junior high, and high school principals. Of the 1000 principals in the sample, 600 were elementary, 174 were middle school/junior high, and 226 were high school.

A 53-item questionnaire was designed to answer the research questions. The questionnaire was distributed to a panel of experts including practicing principals and educational administration faculty members. After the instrument was revised and validated, it was distributed to the sample by mail with a cover letter explaining its purpose. A copy of the cover letter and the questionnaire are found in appendices A and B, respectively.

Results

Of the 1000 questionnaires mailed, 650, or 65 per cent of the sample, were returned in a form useable for analysis. The rate of return was 63 per cent (378 of 600) for elementary principals; seventy-one per cent (123 of 174) for middle school/junior high principals; and 65 per cent (148 of 226) for high school principals.

Analysis of total sample: Data were collected on eight independent variables. Descriptive information for the total sample on campus enrollment, district enrollment, respondents' age, years of experience in the current position, total years of

experience, and sex are found in Appendix C. The chi-square statistic was computed to measure the strength of relationships among independent and dependent variables and Spearman rank-order correlations were computed to measure the relationship among various rankings of data.

Descriptive Statistics for Total Sample: Data were collected to determine the career path of principals. These data were drawn from questionnaire items which pertained to certification, position changes, career mobility, current job satisfaction. Data were also collected and analyzed on principals' perceptions of the importance of selected sources to their success and on principals' perceptions of their levels of expertise and preparedness with respect to selected job responsibilities.

Current Texas certification standards specify a mid-management certificate requiring 45 graduate credits for a school principal at any level. A temporary administrators' certificate may be obtained, however, if the applicant has a masters' degree and twelve hours of the specified core of administrative courses. Of the respondents in this study, 64.6 per cent held a mid-management certificate and another 20.3 per cent held a superintendents' certificate. Five per cent of the respondents held a temporary certificate and 9.3 per cent had legitimate certificates issued under older certification standards, either the 1955 or the 1972 standards. Table 7, below, illustrates the data in response to the question, "Which administrator certificate do you presently have?"

Table 7
Present Administrator's Certificate
Held by Currently Employed Principals in Texas

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
No certificate	4	0.7
Temporary Administrator's	27	5.0
Mid-Management	346	64.6
Superintendent's	109	20.3
Other	50	9.3

Analysis of data shown below in Table 8 related to the type of certificate held when the respondents began their first job as a school administrator shows that a much higher proportion of principals began their first administrator's job with either the temporary certificate or no certificate.

Table 8
Certificate Held When Currently Employed Principals in Texas Began Their First Job as a School Administrator

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
No certificate	70	12.9
Temporary Administrator's	150	27.6
Mid-Management	262	48.3
Superintendent	55	10.1
Other	76	14.0

A comparison of data in Tables 7 and 8 reveals that whereas fewer than six per cent of the employed principals reported currently holding either a temporary administrator's certificate or no certificate, over 40 per cent reported beginning their first job with, at most, a temporary certificate.

A relevant concern to this investigation was the length of time that passed between the receipt of the required mid-management certificate and acquisition of the respondent's first position as principal. If the respondents indicated that they had a mid-management certificate when they acquired their

first administrator's position, they were then asked to indicate how much time had expired between acquisition of the certificate and their first principal's position. The results are tabulated in Table 9.

Table 9
Elapsed Time Between Acquisition Of The Mid-Management Certificate and First Position As Principal

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
Less than 1 year	134	37.9
1-2 years	105	29.7
3-5 years	69	19.5
Over 5 years	46	13.0

The data in Table 9 indicate that over a third of the respondents acquired a principal's position within a year of obtaining their mid-management certificate; but, conversely, over three years expired for another third of the respondents.

A significant factor which was investigated in building the profile of the principalship was the mobility of the people in the position. In other words, how far removed, physically, were they from their home and their university? Tables 10 and 11 display tabulations of the data from questions related to these two points.

Table 10
Job-Related Changes Of Address Since Entering School Administration

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
None	430	66.4
1-2	166	25.6
3-5	44	6.8
Over 5	8	1.2

Table 11
Distance From Current Job To University
Where Administrator Certificate Was Received

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
Under 50 Miles	265	41.7
50-99 Miles	178	28.0
100-249 Miles	123	19.3
250 Miles or More	70	11.0

The data in Tables 10 and 11 indicate that an overwhelming two out of every three principals have had no changes of home address since entering school administration and over two out of three are within 100 miles of the university where they received their certificate.

The career path of the responding principals predominantly took one of three routes. The most often reported was from assistant principal to principal (42.6 per cent); the second most frequently reported was from classroom teacher to principal29.8 per cent); and the third route in frequency was from a principal's position in another building to the current job as principal (19 per cent). The full results are tabulated below in Table 12.

Table 12
Position Held Immediately Prior To
Current Position as Building Principal

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
Assistant Principal	262	42.6
Principal in Another Bldg.	117	19.0
Central Office	46	7.5
Superintendent	7	1.1
Classroom Teacher	183	29.8
Position Outside Education	3	0.5

A very high proportion of the principal respondents moved into the principalship from positions within the same district.

Virtually three out of every five (59.2 per cent) moved from a position within the same district and another one out of six (16.3 per cent) moved from a position in the same building. Only one out of three came from a position outside the district. Table 13, below, is a tabulation of these data.

Table 13
Location of Position Held Immediately Prior To Current Position As Principal

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
In Same Building	103	16.3
In Same District	375	59.2
Outside District	157	24.8

The principals who responded to the questionnaire indicated a high level of satisfaction with their current job. Over 80 per cent reported that they were either satisfied or extremely satisfied with their job. Table 14 displays the frequency of responses related to degrees of job satisfaction.

Table 14
Satisfaction With Current Job As School Principal

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
Extremely Satsified	265	41.6
Satisfied	300	47.1
Neither	42	6.6
Dissatisfied	28	4.4
Extremely Dissatisfied	2	0.3

One of the research questions was "What are principals' perceived sources of their competence?" The principals in the sample were asked to rate a selected list of sources with a number between one and 5, with 5 representing "extremely important" and 1 representing "extremely unimportant." The

results of this process are displayed below in Table 15.

Table 15
Principals' Perceptions Of The Importance of Selected Sources To Their Perceived Success As A Principal

Rank	Source	Mean	Median
1	On-the-job experiences	4.62	5.00
2	Common sense	4.56	5.00
3	Workshops/In-Service	3.71	4.00
4	Modeling after other administrators	3.65	4.00
5	University educational administration program	3.61	4.00
6	Experiences gained outside education	3.47	4.00

Even though the results depicted in Table 15 may not be comfortable to educational administration professors, they appear to be intuitively obvious. Principals saw more value in their on-the-job experiences and in common sense than from university educational administration programs or from experiences gained outside education. The data show, in fact, that principals tended to place more value on in-service activities and modeling after other administrators than they did on educational administration programs, even though the median scores on the latter four sources are identical.

Principals in the sample were asked to react in several ways to a selected set of responsibilities or skills frequently attributed to the realm of the principalship. First, the principals were asked to rate these responsibilities according to their perception of the importance of each responsibility to the success of any principal. Second, they were asked to rate the same responsibilities according to their perceived level of

expertise in each. finally, the principals were asked to rate the same set of responsibilities according to their perceptions of how well they were prepared to assume them by their university educational administration program. A tabulation of these rankings is shown below in Table 16.

Table 16
Perceived Importance Of Selected Responsibilities To Principal Success, Level Of Expertise, And Level Of Preparedness Provided By Educational Administration Program

Responsibility	Importance to Success (Means)	Level of Expertise (Means)	Adequacy of Univ.Program (Means)
Instructional Leadership	4.68	4.09	3.17
Campus Leadership	4.66	4.33	3.17
Interpersonal Relations	4.62	4.30	2.97
Student Management	4.41	4.31	2.76
Public Relations	4.34	4.06	3.06
Teacher Evaluation	4.30	4.07	2.31
Staff Development	4.13	3.64	2.75
Curriculum Development	3.99	3.60	2.99
Physical Plant Management	3.87	3.76	2.72
Budget and Finance	3.73	3.52	2.79

The Spearman rho rank difference correlation coefficient was computed to determine the relationship among the three rankings shown in Table 16. The Spearman rho for the relationship of column one, perceived importance to success, with column two, perceived level of expertise, was 0.87. The coefficient for the relationship of column one, perceived importance to success, with

column three, perceived adequacy of university preparation, was 0.60. The Spearman rho rank difference correlation coefficient between column two, perceived level of expertise, with column three, perceived adequacy of university preparation, was 0.31.

Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables

Using the Chi-Square statistic, each of the seven independent variables was tested against the following variables:

1. Current administrator's Certificate
2. Administrator's certificate held when first administrator job was obtained
3. Elapsed time between receipt of mid-management certificate and first job as principal
4. Tob-related changes of home address
5. Distance of current job from the University where administrator training was received
6. Position held immediately prior to current principal's position
7. Location of position held immediately prior to current principal's position
8. Satisfaction with current job

The following matrix depicts those pairs of variables which were tested, and those which yielded a significant relationship (alpha = 0.05) are indicated with an asterisk. The numbers (1-8) at the top of each column identify the eight variables listed above, respectively:

MATRIX A
Significant Relationships Between Demographic Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
a. Organizational Level						*	*	
b. Campus Enrollment		*				*	*	
c. District Enrollment			*		*	*	*	
d. Age	*		*					
e. Years' Exper. Current Job	*							
f. Total Years' Experience	*	*		*		*		
g. Gender	*			*	*	*	*	*

a x 6: high school principals were more likely to have come from a principalship in another building than were middle school/junior high principals or elementary principals. Elementary principals were more likely to have come directly from the classroom than were either high school or middle school/junior high principals (See Appendix D, Table 17).

a x 7: high schol principals were more likely to have come from a position outside the district than were either middle school/junior high or high school principals (See Appendix D, Table 18).

b x 2: principals on campuses with smaller enrollments were more likely to hold the temporary administrator's certificate or no certificate than were principals on campuses with larger enrollments (See Appendix D, Table 19).

b x 6: principals on campuses with smaller enrollments were more likely to have moved directly from the classroom, whereas principals on campuses with larger enrollments were more likely

to have moved into the principalship from the assistant principalship (See Appendix D, Table 20).

b x 7: principals on campuses with smaller enrollments were more likely to have come from outside the district than were principals on campuses with larger enrollments (See Appendix D, Table 21).

c x 3: principals in districts with smaller enrollments were more likely to have obtained their principalship within one year of receipt of their mid-management certificate while principals in districts with larger enrollments were more likely to have waited 3-5 years to acquire their principalship after receipt of their mid-management certificate (See Appendix D, Table 22).

c x 5: principals in districts with larger enrollments were closer to the university where they received their administrator training than were principals in districts with smaller enrollments (See Appendix d, Table 23).

c x 6: principals in districts with smaller enrollments were more likely to have moved into the principalship directly from the classroom than were principals in districts with larger enrollments (See Appendix d, Table 24).

c x 7: principals in districts with smaller enrollments were more likely to have moved into the principalship from a position outside the district than were principals in districts with larger enrollments (See Appendix d, Table 25).

d x 1: younger principals were more likely to currently hold the mid-management certificate than were older principals

(See Appendix d, Table 26).

d x 3: older principals were more likely to have waited longer to acquire their first principalship after receipt of their mid-management certificate than were younger principals (See Appendix d, Table 27).

e x 1: principals with more years' experience in their current position were more likely to hold the superintendent's certificate than were principals with fewer years' experience while principals with fewer years' experience in their current position were more likely to hold the temporary administrator's certificate than were principals with more total years' experience (See Appendix d, Table 28).

f x 1: principals with more years' total experience were more likely to hold the superintendent's certificate or some other higher certificate than were principals with fewer total years' experience (See Appendix d, Table 29).

f x 2: younger principals were more likely to have acquired the mid-management certificate when they acquired their first principalship than were older principals (See Appendix d, Table 30).

f x 4: principals with fewer years' total experience were more likely to have had fewer job-related moves than were principals with more years' total experience (See Appendix d, Table 31).

f x 6: principals with fewer years' total experience were more likely to have moved into the principalship directly from the classroom than were principals with more years' total

experience while principals with more years' total experience were more likely to have moved into the principalship from an assistant principal's position than were principals with fewer years' total experience (See Appendix d, Table 32).

g x 1: male principals were more likely to hold the superintendent's certificate than were female principals (See Appendix d, Table 33).

g x 4: male principals were more likely to have have had a greater number of job-related moves than were female principals (See Appendix d, Table 34).

g x 5: female principals were more likely to be located closer to the university where they received their administrator's training than were male principals (See Appendix d, Table 35).

g x 6: female principals' position held immediately prior to current position was more likely to have been either assistant principal or central office while male principals' position held was more likely to have been classroom teacher or principal in another building (See Appendix d, Table 36).

g x 7: female principals were more likely to have moved into the principalship from a position within the same building or district while male principals were more likely to have moved from a position outside the district (See Appendix d, Table 37).

g x 8: female principals were more likely to have expressed a higher level of job satisfaction than were male principals (See Appendix d, Table 37).

Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceptions of Sources of Competence to Succeed as a Building Principal: In order to determine whether or not principals' perceptions of the sources of their competence was significantly different within groups of principals, the chi-square statistic was used to test the strength of relationships. Each of the seven demographic variables was tested against each of the six selected sources of competence. In addition, three additional variables related to the principals' certification status were tested against the source variables. The following matrix shows the pairs of variables tested and indicates with an asterisk those which yielded a significant relationship at the 0.05 level:

MATRIX B
Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables Principals' Perceptions of Sources of Competence to Succeed as a Building Principal

	1	2	3	4	5	6
a. Organizational Level						
b. Campus Enrollment				*		
c. District Enrollment						
d. Principal's Age			*			
e. Years' Current Experience			*			
f. Total Years' Experience						
g. Gender			*			
h. Present Certificate						
i. First Certificate						
j. Wait Time After Certificate						

1=University Educ. Admin. Program
2=Workshops and in-service
3=Modeling after other administrators
4=On-the-job experiences
5=Common sense
6=Experiences outside education

b x 4: principals on campuses with larger enrollments were more likely to value the importance of on-the-job experiences than were principals on campuses with smaller enrollments (See Appendix E, Table 39).

d x 3: younger principals were more likely to value the importance of modeling after other administrators than were older principals (See Appendix E, Table 40).

e x 3: principals with fewer than three years' experience in their current position were more likely to value the importance of modeling after other administrators than were principals with more years' experience in their current position (See Appendix E, Table 41).

g x 3: female principals were more likely to value the importance of modeling after other administrators than were male principals (See Appendix E, Table 42).

Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Perceived Importance of Selected Skills to the Success of any Principal: The chi-square statistic was used to test relationships between the seven demographic variables plus the three certification-related variables and principals' perceived importance of selected skills to any principal's success. Significant relationships were found between principals'

organizational level and instructional leadership; campus enrollment and interpersonal relations skills as well as teacher evaluation skills; district enrollment and budgeting and finance skills; and years' experience in current position and curriculum development. The matrix below displays all pairs of variables tested, and an asterisk marks those which tested significantly at the 0.05 level:

MATRIX C
Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Perceived Importance of Selected Skills to the Success of any Principal

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a. Organizational Level							*			
b. Campus Enrollment	*							*		
c. District Enrollment				*						
d. Age										
e. Years' Current Experience						*				
f. Total Years' Experience										
g. Gender										
h. Present Certificate										
i. First Certificate										
j. Wait Time After Certificate										

1=Interpersonal Relations
2=Campus Leadership
3=Public Relations
4=Budgeting and Finance
5=Physical Plant Management
6=Curriculum Development
7=Instructional Leadership
8=Teacher Evaluation
9=Staff Development
10=Student Management

a x 7: elementary principals perceived a greater importance in instructional leadership to the success of any principal than did either middle school/junior high or high school principals (See Appendix F, Table 43).

b x 1: principals from campuses with larger enrollments perceived a greater importance in interpersonal relations skills than did principals from campuses with smaller enrollments (See Appendix F, Table 44).

b x 8: principals from campuses with the smallest enrollments (fewer than 250) perceived a lesser importance in teacher evaluation skills than did principals from the larger schools (See Appendix F, Table 45).

c x 4: principals from districts with larger enrollments perceived a greater importance in budgeting and finance skills than did principals from districts with smaller enrollments (See Appendix F, Table 46).

e x 6: principals with fewer years' experience in their current position perceived a greater importance in curriculum development skills than did principals with more years' experience (See Appendix F, Table 47).

Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Level of Expertise in Selected Skill Areas. The ten selected skill areas identified above were the basis for determining principals' perceived expertise in the principalship. Principals were asked to indicate a level of expertise ranging from "very strong" on the high end to "very weak" on the low end.

The matrix below displays the pairs of variables tested, and those pairs which yielded a significant relationship at the 0.05 alpha level are indicated by an asterisk.

MATRIX D
Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Level of Expertise in Selected Skill Areas

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a. Organizational Level							*			
b. Campus Enrollment			*							
c. District Enrollment		*		*			*			
d. Principal's Age		*								*
e. Current Experience				*						
f. Total Experience				*	*	*			*	
g. Gender						*	*	*		
h. Present Certificate										
i. First Certificate										
j. Wait Time After Certificate										

1=Interpersonal Relations
2=Campus Leadership
3=Public Relations
4=Budgeting and Finance
5=Physical Plant Management
6=Curriculum Development
7=Instructional Leadership
8=Teacher Evaluation
9=Staff Development
10=Student Management

a x 7: high school principals perceived a higher level of expertise in teacher evaluation than did either elementary or junior high/middle school principals (See Appendix G, Table 48).

b x 3: principals from smaller districts perceived a lower

level of expertise in campus leadership than did principals from larger districts (See Appendix G, Table 49).

c x 2: principals from campuses with smaller enrollments perceived a lower level of expertise in public relations than did principals from campuses with larger enrollments (See Appendix G, Table 50).

c x 4: principals from districts with enrollments under 1000 perceived a lower level of expertise in budgeting and finance skills than did principals from districts with larger enrollments (See Appendix G, Table 51).

c x 7: principals from districts with enrollments under 1000 perceived a lower level of expertise in instructional leadership skills than did principals from districts with enrollments over 2,500 (See Appendix G, Table 52).

d x 2: older principals perceived a higher level of expertise in campus leadership than did younger principals (See Appendix G, Table 53).

d x 10: principals in the 30-50 year age range perceived a higher level of expertise in student management than did older principals (See Appendix G, Table 54).

e x 4: principals with fewer than three years' experience in their current position perceived a lower level of expertise in budgeting and finance skills than did principals with more years' experience in their current job (See Appendix G, Table 55).

f x 4: principals with more years' total experience perceived a higher level of expertise in budgeting and finance skills than did principals with fewer years' total experience

(See Appendix G, Table 56).

f x 5: principals with more years' total experience perceived a higher level of expertise in physical plant management than did principals with fewer years' total experience (See Appendix G, Table 57).

f x 6: principals with more years' total experience perceived a higher level of expertise in curriculum development than did principals with fewer years' total experience (See Appendix G, Table 58).

f x 9: principals with more years' total experience perceived a higher level of expertise in staff development skills than did principals with fewer years' total experience (See Appendix G, Table 59).

g x 6: female principals perceived a higher level of expertise in curriculum development than did male principals (See Appendix G, Table 60).

g x 7: female principals perceived a higher level of expertise in instructional leadership than did male principals (See Appendix G, Table 61).

g x 8: female principals perceived a higher level of expertise in teacher evaluation than did male principals (See Appendix G, Table 62).

Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Level of Preparation Received in Their University Educational Administration Program. Principals were asked to indicate the level of preparation as provided by their

university educational administration program in each of the ten selected administration skill areas. The matrix below displays the pairs of variables tested, and those pairs which yielded a significant relationship at an alpha level of 0.05 are indicated by an asterisk.

MATRIX E
Significant Relationships Among Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Level of Preparation Received in Their University Educational Administration Program

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a. Organizational Level										
b. Campus Enrollment								*		*
c. District Enrollment										
d. Principal's Age										
e. Years' Current Experience										
f. Total Years' Experience										
g. Gender	*	*			*		*		*	
g. Present Certificate										
h. First Certificate										
i. Wait Time After Certificate										

1=Interpersonal Relations
2=Campus Leadership
3=Public Relations
4=Budgeting and Finance
5=Physical Plant Management
6=Curriculum Development
7=Instructional Leadership
8=Teacher Evaluation
9=Staff Development
10=Student Management

b x 8: principals from campuses with smaller enrollments

perceived a better preparation in teacher evaluation than did principals from campuses with larger enrollments (See Appendix H, Table 63).

b x 10: principals from campuses with enrollments between 250-500 perceived a better preparation in student management than did either principals from campuses with smaller enrollments or principals from campuses with larger enrollments (See Appendix H, Table 64).

g x 1: male principals perceived a better preparation in interpersonal relations than did female principals (See Appendix H, Table 65).

g x 2: female principals perceived a better preparation in campus leadership skills than did male principals (See Appendix H, Table 66).

g x 5: male principals perceived a better preparation in physical plant management skills than did female principals (See Appendix H, Table 67).

g x 7: female principals perceived a better preparation in instructional leadership skills than did male principals (See Appendix H, Table 68).

g x 9: female principals perceived a better preparation in staff development skills than did male principals (See Appendix H, Table 69).

Analysis of Open-Ended Responses. The principals were asked to respond to the questions, "In a few words, what is most satisfying about your current job as principal?" and "In a few

words, what is most dissatisfying about your current job as principal?" Each response was tallied, and in those cases where more than one satisfier or dissatisfier was listed, a tally was marked for each. The total number of tallies for each group of respondents, therefore, exceeds the number of respondents. All satisfiers and dissatisfiers that had fewer than five tallies were grouped together in the category "Other." The matrices below summarize the open-ended responses:

MATRIX F
Job Satisfiers For Elementary, Junior High/Middle School, and High School Principals

Satisfier	Elem. Count	Elem. (%)	Jr.Hi./MS Count	Jr.Hi./MS (%)	High School Count	High School (%)
Students/Teachers	271	72 *	94	76 *	93	63 *
Around Dedicated People	72	19	7	4	11	7
Satisfaction in Success of Others	44	12	7	4		
Personal Challenge	16	4	9	7	6	4
Leadership Opportunity	63	17	21	13	31	21
Program Development	8	2	6	5	5	3
School Climate	13	3	5	4	5	3
Community Support	8	2				
Other	11	3	10	8	10	7

*Percentages based on 378 elementary principals, 123 junior high/middle school principals, and 148 high school principals who responded to the questionnaire.

MATRIX G
Job Dissatisfiers for Elementary, Junior High/Middle School, and High School Principals

Dissatisfiers	Elem. Count	(%)	Jr.Hi./MS Count	(%)	High School Count	(%)
Teacher Evaluation-Texas Teacher Appraisal System	99	26 *	25	20 *	47	32 *
Education Reform in Texas	46	12	17	14	31	21
Parents (Unsupportive, Apathetic, Uncooperative)	45	12	11	9	5	3
Undedicated Teachers	15	4				
Central Office Leadership	24	6			6	4
Paperwork	65	17	22	18	21	14
Lack of Time	28	7	10	8	16	17
Financial Problems	12	3	5	4		
Pressure/Stress	8	2				
Student Management	12	3	9	7		
Custodian Supervision	8	2				
Understaffed	7	2				
Local Politics	10	3				
Apathetic Students			12	15	8	5
Public Image of Education					5	3

* The percentages shown are based on returns from 378 elementary principals, 123 junior high/middle school principals, and 148 high school principals.

Conclusions

Each of the four questions investigated yielded a set of conclusions which appear to confirm that the principalship, as perceived by practicing principals, is a complex, multi-faceted role. Rather than being described by profile as suggested in the title of this paper, the principalship may, instead, be best

described as multi-dimensional. When perceptions of the entire smaple are analyzed, for example, the results neatly overlay other research findings and intuitive logic. When perceptions of various subsets of the sample are analyzed and compared one to the other, however, the results reveal a complex set of relationships.

Sources of Competence. One-the-job experiences and common sense were seen as the most important sources of competence by principals. University educational administration preparation programs and experiences gained outside of education were seen as least important. An explanation of the relatively low perceived importance of educational administration preparation programs may be that principals have internalized the learnings to the extend that they are perceived as common sense.

Modeling after other administrators was the one source that yielded differences among subsets of principals. Principals from campuses with larger enrollments, younger principals, principals with fewer than three years' experience in their current job, and female principals were significantly more likely to value the importance of modeling than were their counterparts. Except for this one source of modeling after other administrators, all subsets tested yielded no significant differences in relative importance of the sources.

Importance of and Level of Expertise in Selected Administrative Skills and Adeequcy of University Educational Administration Programs in Preparing Principals to Execute the Skills. Whereas the principals surveyed perceived all ten areas

of responsibility to be of importance, they saw university educational administration preparation programs to be of lesser importance in preparing them to execute the skills. The lowest ranked skill area in perceived importance to success was budgeting and finance skills. This area had a mean of 3.73 on a one-to-five scale with five being high. Conversely, preparation in instructional leadership by university educational administration programs yielded the highest mean of only 3.17.

When principals' perceived level of expertise was compared to perceived adequacy of preparation, level of expertise yielded much higher means, and the rank difference correlation coefficient was a relatively low 0.31. Thus, while principals saw themselves with relatively high levels of expertise in all ten areas, they did not attribute this expertise to their university preparation programs.

When relationships among subsets of principals were tested against principals' perceived level of expertise in the selected skill areas, those which yielded significant relationships were size of district, age of the principal, total administrative experience, and gender of the principal (See Matrix D). Findings related to principals' gender were the most intriguing. Female principals saw themselves as having significantly more expertise in curriculum development, instructional leadership, and teacher evaluation skills than did male principals. One possible explanation of these findings is that female principals are, in general, newer to the principalship and are, therefore, more aware of the importance of these skills.

Gender was again the variable that yielded significant differences in relationships when compared to principals' perceptions of the adequacy of their university preparation program in educational administration. Male principals perceived a higher level of preparation in interpersonal relations and in physical plant management skills while female principals perceived a higher level of preparation in campus leadership skills, instructional leadership skills, and staff development skills. A study of these results may lead to a conclusion similar to the one related to perceived expertise. Since female principals are, in general, newer to the principalship, they may be more aware of the importance of these skills. Another possible reason may be that the females in the study were predominantly at the elementary level, and traditionally elementary principals have expressed a greater interest in curriculum and instruction skills than their counterparts at the secondary level.

Open-Ended Responses. No surprises were found in the examination of open-ended responses in which principals were asked to indicate what is most satisfying to them in their current job. By an overwhelming majority, principals see their association with students and teachers to be the most satisfying. Working relationships with what were termed "dedicated people," regardless of where they were, was also given as an important satisfier. Opportunities for leadership, the personal challenge associated with the principalship, and personal satisfaction in the success of others were also perceived to be satisfiers.

Those satisfiers mentioned less often were program development, the school climate, and community support. Thus, one may conclude that principals enjoy their job because of leadership opportunities with dedicated people, especially students and teachers.

Whereas the range of satisfiers was basically limited to eight, the dissatisfiers mentioned numbered approximately forty. All three organizational groups of principals agreed that the new Texas Teacher Appraisal System, educational reform, paperwork, lack of time, and unsupportive/apathetic/uncooperative parents were major dissatisfiers. The most frequently mentioned of these were coping with educational reform and the Texas Teacher Appraisal System.

Elementary principals tended to indicate a wider range of dissatisfiers than did either junior high/middle school or high school principals. Elementary principals mentioned uncommitted teachers whereas the other two groups did not; they mentioned pressure and/or stress whereas the other two groups did not; they mentioned custodial supervision whereas the other two groups did not; they mentioned understaffing whereas the other two groups did not; and they mentioned local politics, either in the district or in the community whereas the the other two groups did not.

Analysis of the open-ended responses as well as the categorical responses appear to describe the principal as someone who is generally more satisfied than dissatisfied; someone who has a high perception of expertise in the field; and as someone

who looks upon common sense and on-the-job experiences as being of greater value than education received in a university program in educational administration.

Bibliography

Allison, Derek J., and others. "Thinking Critically About Educational Administration: A Martian View." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Association for the Study of Educational Administration, Vancouver, B.C., June 5, 1983. ED 251 933.

Beck, John J. "thje Administrative Manager in the 21st Century: An International Perspective." Paper presented at the Pan-Pacific Converence II: A Business, Economic, and Technological Exchange, Seoul, Korea, May, 1985. ED 258 333

Carnine, Douglas, Russel Gersten, and Susan Green. "The Principal as Instructional Leader: A Second Look." Educational Leadership 40(December, 1982), 47-50.

Cawelti, Gordon. "Training for Effective School Administrators." Educational Leadership 39(February, 1982), 324-329.

Dianda, Marcella R. The Superintendent's Can-Do Guide to School Improvement. Washington, D. C: Council for Educational Development and Research, 1984. 113 pages.

Gibboney, richard A. "Education of Administrators: 'An American Tragedy'." Education Week (April 15, 1987), 28.

Goodlad, John I. A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future. New York(McGraw Hill, 1983).

Greenfield, William D. "Being and Becoming a Principal: Responses to Work contexts and Socialization Processes." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, March 31-April 4, 1985. ED 254 932.

Greenfield, William D. "Research on Public School Principals: A Review and Recommendations." Paper prepared for the National Conference on the Principalship, convened by the National Institute for Education, Washington, D.C., October 20-22, 1982. ED 224 178.

Howell, Bruce. "Profile of the Principalship." Educational Leadership 38(January, 1981), 333-336.

Hoyle, John R., F. English, and B. Steffy. Skills for Successful School Leaders. Arlington, Virginia (American Association of School Administrators, 1985).

Joyce, Bruce R. Improving America's Schools. New York (Longman Press, 1986).

Page, Jane A. and Fred M. Page, Jr. "Principals' Perceptions of

Their Role and the Perceived Effectiveness of Their Academic Preparation for that Role." Educational Resources Information Center, 1984. ED 242 710

Pharis, William L. and Sally Banks Zakariya. The Elementary School Principalship in 1978: A Research Study. Reston, Virginia (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1979).

_____. Performance-Based Preparation of Principals: A Framework for Improvement. Reston, Virginia (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1985).

Thomson, Scott. "The Eighties: How Are We Doing?" NASSP Bulletin 70(March, 1986), 40-49.

Trider, Donald M., Kenneth A. Leithwood, and Deborah J. Montgomery, "Exploring the Causes of Principal Behavior." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Americna Educational Research Association, Chicago, March 31-April 4, 1985. ED 257 178.

Weldy, Gilbert R. Principals: What They Do and Who they Are. Reston, Virginia (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979).

Wolcott, Harry F. The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. New York (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973).

APPENDIX A

Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas 78666-4616 AC512 245-2575

Department of Educational Administration
and Psychological Services

January 5, 1986

Dear Colleague:

Your role as building principal is critical in determining school effectiveness. Most researchers and other observers of the educational scene have referred to the building principal as the "gatekeeper of change." The overall effectiveness of a school is often traced directly to the actions of the principal.

As we all search for ways to increase the principal's opportunities for success, it becomes very important to learn more about who the principal is, what is important to the principal, and what the principal believes to be important concerning his or her role. These data can be used to help the profession meet its responsibilities.

I am interested in studying the role of the principal in Texas. You have been selected to participate in a study which investigates this issue. **Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire, and return it in the envelope which has been provided.** If you have any questions or concerns, please call me at (512) 245-2575

Sincerely,

John J. Beck, Jr., Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Enclosures

QUESTIONNAIRE
Role of the Principal

DIRECTIONS: Please check or circle the choice listed for each item which best describes you or your school.

1. **Your campus enrollment**
   ___(1) Under 250
   ___(2) 250-500
   ___(3) 501-1000
   ___(4) Over 1000

2. **Your District Enrollment**
   ___(1) Under 1000
   ___(2) 1000-2500
   ___(3) 2501-10,000
   ___(4) Over 10,000

3. ___ **Education Service Center Region to which your district belongs.**

4. **Your age**
   ___(1) Under 30
   ___(2) 30-39
   ___(3) 40-49
   ___(4) 50-59
   ___(5) 60 or over

5. **Years experience in current position**
   ___(1) Under 3
   ___(2) 3-5
   ___(3) 6-10
   ___(4) 11-15
   ___(5) Over 15

6. **Total years experience as a school administrator**
   ___(1) Under 3
   ___(2) 3-5
   ___(3) 6-10
   ___(4) 11-15
   ___(5) Over 15

7. **Your sex**
   ___(1) Female
   ___(2) Male

8. **Which administrator certificate do you presently have?**
   ___(1) None
   ___(2) Temporary Mid-Management Administrator
   ___(3) Mid-Management Administrator
   ___(4) Superintendent
   ___(5) Other _____

9. **Which administrator certificate did you have when you began your first job as a school administrator?**
   ___(1) None
   ___(2) Temporary Mid-Management Administrator
   ___(3) Mid-Management Administrator
   ___(4) Superintendent
   ___(5) Other _____

IF YOU CHECKED RESPONSE (3), ABOVE, ANSWER #10. OTHERWISE, SKIP TO #11

10. **How long did you have your Mid-Management Administrator Certificate before you got your first job as a principal?**
   ___(1) Less than 1 year
   ___(2) 1-2 years
   ___(3) 3-5 years
   ___(4) Over 5 years

11. **Since entering school administration, how many job-related changes of home address have you had?**
   ___(1) None
   ___(2) 1-2
   ___(3) 3-5
   ___(4) Over 5

12. **How far is your current job from the university where you received your Mid-Management Administrator certificate?**
   ___(1) Under 50 miles
   ___(2) 50-99 miles
   ___(3) 100-249 miles
   ___(4) 250 miles or more

13. **What position did you hold immediately prior to your current position as building principal?**
   ___(1) Assistant principal
   ___(2) Principal in another building
   ___(3) Central office administrator
   ___(4) Superintendent
   ___(5) Classroom teacher
   ___(6) Position outside of education

14. **Where were you located when you held the position immediately prior to your current position as principal?**
   ___(1) In the same building
   ___(2) In the same district
   ___(3) Outside of the district

15. **How satisfied are you with your current job?**
   ___(1) Extremely satisfied
   ___(2) Satisfied
   ___(3) Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
   ___(4) Dissatisfied
   ___(5) Extremely dissatisfied

Rate the following sources according to their importance to you in providing you with the necessary competence to succeed as a principal. Enter a number between 5 and 1, with 5 = "Extremely important," 4 = "Important," 3 = "Unsure," 2 = "Unimportant," and 1 = "Extremely unimportant."

___ 16. University educational administration program

___ 17. Workshops and in-service attended

___ 18. Modeling after other administrators

___ 19. On-the-job experiences

___ 20. Common sense

___ 21. Experiences gained outside of education

PLEASE CONTINUE ON BACK SIDE

APPENDIX C

TABULATION OF FREQUENCY OF RESPONSE AND PER CENT RESPONSE BY CATEGORICAL VALUE FOR SIX INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

Table I
Campus Enrollment of Respondents

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
< 250	127	19.7
250-500	205	31.7
501-1000	227	35.1
> 1000	87	13.5

Table 2
District Enrollment of Respondents

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
< 1000	110	20.9
1000-2500	85	16.2
2501-10,000	123	23.4
> 10,000	208	39.5

Table 3
Age of Respondents

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
< 30	5	00.8
30-39	136	21.0
40-49	272	42.0
50-59	215	33.2
> 59	20	03.0

Table 4
Years' Experience in Current Position

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
< 3	160	29.0
3-5	114	20.7
6-10	108	19.6
11-15	71	12.9
> 15	99	17.9

Table 5
Total Years' Experience as a School Administrator

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
< 3	60	09.3
3-5	107	16.6
6-10	160	24.9
11-15	131	20.4
> 15	185	28.8

Table 6
Gender of Respondent

Value	Frequency	Per Cent
Female	141	24.7
Male	430	75.3

APPENDIX D

Tables of Relationships Between Pairs of Demographic Variables

TABLE 17
Relationship Between Principals' Organizational Level and Immediate Prior Position

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Elem. Prin.	143	57	33	5	120	358
MS/Jr.Hi. Prin.	62	21	6	1	30	120
High School Prin.	57	39	7	1	33	137
Total	262	117	46	7	183	605

1 = Assistant Principal
2 = Principal in Another Building
3 = Central Office Administrator
4 = Superintendent
5 = Classroom Teacher

Chi-Square = 20.13 on 10 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 18
Relationship Between Principals' Organizational Level and Immediate Prior Location

	1	2	3	Total
Elem. Prin.	45	244	82	371
M.S./Jr. Hi. Prin.	28	72	23	123
High School Prin.	30	59	52	141
Total	103	375	157	635

1 = in the same building
2 = in the same district
3 = outside of the district

Chi-Square = 30.47 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 19
Relationship Between Campus Enrollment and Principals' First Administrator's Certificate

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	29	34	39	7	12	121
250-500	20	51	88	16	21	196
501-1000	18	43	105	19	31	216
Over 1000	3	21	29	13	12	78
Total	70	149	261	55	76	611

1 = None
2 = Temporary Mid-Management
3 = Mid-Management Administrator
4 = Superintendent
5 = Other

Chi-Square = 40.02 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 20
Relationship Between Campus Enrollment and Principals' Immediate Prior Position

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	22	19	9	2	59	111
250-500	73	29	13	3	75	193
501-1000	106	51	17	2	46	222
Over 1000	58	18	7	0	3	86
Total	259	117	46	7	183	611

1 = Assistant principal
2 = Principal in another building
3 = Central office administrator
4 = superintendent
5 = classroom teacher

Chi-square = 91.11 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 21
Relationship Between Campus Enrollment and Principals' Prior Location

	1	2	3	Total
Under 250	20	44	57	121
250-500	27	156	51	234
501-1000	35	146	42	223
Over 1000	20	57	7	84
Total	102	403	157	652

1 = in the same building
2 = in the same district
3 = outside of the district

Chi-square = 59.81 on 6 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 22
Relationship Between Principals' District Enrollment and Time Lapse Between Receipt of Mid-Management Certificate and First Job as Building Principal

	1	2	3	4	Total
Under 1000	28	30	29	7	94
1000-2500	9	24	33	9	75
2501-10,000	9	26	60	7	102
Over 10,000	12	40	90	24	166
Total	58	120	212	47	437

1 = less than one year
2 = 1-2 years
3 = 3-5 years
4 = over 5 years

Chi-Square = 41.890 on 9 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 23
Relationship Between District Enrollment and Distance From University Where Principal Received Certification to Location of Present Job as Principal

	1	2	3	4	Total
Under 1000	30	36	30	11	107
1000-2500	26	28	19	11	84
2501-10,000	44	38	24	15	121
Over 10,000	111	46	29	16	202
Total	211	148	102	53	614

1 = Under 50 Miles
2 = 50-99 miles
3 = 100-249 miles
4 = 250 miles or more

Chi-Square = 30.23 on 9 df ($p < 0.05$

TABLE 24
Relationship Between District Enrollment and Principals' Immediate Prior Position

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 1000	12	18	8	2	55	95
1000-2500	31	19	3	0	30	83
2501-10,000	56	21	12	2	31	122
Over 10,000	117	40	15	1	26	200
Total	216	98	38	5	142	600

1 = Assistant Principal
2 = Principal in Another Building
3 = Central Office Administrator
4 = Superintendent
5 = Classroom Teacher

Chi-Square = 90.71 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 25
Relationship Between District Enrollment and Principals' Location in Immediately Prior Position

	1	2	3	Total
Under 1000	21	36	48	105
1000-2500	17	39	27	83
2501-10,000	17	74	30	121
Over 10,000	29	164	13	206
Total	84	313	118	615

1 = In the same building
2 = In the same district
3 = Outside of the district

Chi-Square = 81.66 on 6 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 26
Relationship Between Principals' Age and Type of Current Administrators' Certificate

	1	2	3	4	Total
Under 39	8	94	13	1	116
40-49	12	147	47	20	228
50-59	5	98	42	29	176
60 and Over	2	7	6	0	15
Total	27	346	108	50	635

1 = Temporary Mid-Management Administrator
2 = Mid-Management Administrator
3 = Superintendent
4 = Other

Chi-Square = 45.40 on 9 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 27
Relationship Between Principals' Age and Elapsed Time Between Receipt of Mid-Management Certificate and First Job as Principal

	1	2	3	4	Total
Under 39	28	35	16	6	85
40-49	67	41	29	13	150
50-59	35	28	23	24	110
60 and Over	4	1	1	3	9
Total	134	105	69	46	354

1 = Less than 1 year
2 = 1-2 years
3 = 3-5 years
4 = Over 5 years

Chi-Square = 25.26 on 9 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 28
Relationship Between Principals' Experience in Present Position and Type of Present Administrators' Certificate

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	1	15	97	20	4	137
3-5 Years	0	3	70	19	4	96
6-10 Years	1	0	66	18	6	91
11-15 Years	1	1	22	21	16	61
Over 15 Years	1	4	37	22	14	78
Total	4	23	292	100	44	663

1 = None
2 = Temporary Mid-Management Administrator
3 = Mid-Management Administrator
4 = Superintendent
5 = Other

Chi-Square = 75.41 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 29
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Type of Administrators' Certificate Currently Held

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	1	12	37	1	0	51
3-5 Years	0	7	71	15	0	93
6-10 Years	1	0	109	18	6	134
11-15 Years	1	3	60	30	18	112
Over 15 Years	1	4	66	44	25	140
Total	4	26	343	108	49	630

1 = None
2 = Temporary Mid-Management Administrator
3 = Mid-Management Administrator
4 = Superintendent
5 = Other

Chi-Square = 121.58 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 30
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Type of Administrators' Certificate Held at Time of First Administrative Position

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	5	12	36	1	0	54
3-5 Years	8	37	48	5	5	103
6-10 Years	17	43	74	10	11	155
11-15 Years	17	40	35	18	16	126
Over 15 Years	22	18	66	20	43	169
Total	69	150	259	54	75	607

1 = None
2 = Temporary Administrator's
3 = Mid-Management
4 = Superintenden
5 = Other

Chi-Square = 89.94 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 31
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Number of Job-Related Moves (Changes in Home Address)

	1	2	3	4	Total
Under 3 Years	52	8	0	0	60
3-5 Years	77	29	1	0	107
6-10 Years	102	48	9	1	160
11-15 Years	88	27	13	2	130
Over 15 Years	106	53	21	5	185
Total	425	165	44	8	642

1 = None
2 = 1-2 moves
3 = 3-5 moves
4 = Over 5 moves

Chi-Square = 36.48 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 32
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Position Held Immediately Prior to Current Position

	1	2	3	4	Total
Under 3 Years	14	2	7	33	56
3-5 Years	50	15	7	27	99
6-10 Years	74	27	12	38	151
11-15 Years	57	26	9	29	121
Over 15 years	63	46	11	55	175
Total	258	116	46	182	632

1 = Assistant Principal
2 = Principal in Another Building
3 = Central Office Administrator
4 = Classroom Teacher

Chi-Square = 42.94 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 33
Relationship Between Gender of Principal and Type of Administrators' Certificate Currently Held

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	2	10	92	17	7	128
Male	2	14	213	84	39	352
Total	4	24	305	101	46	480

1 = None
2 = Temporary Administrator's
3 = Mid-Management
4 = Superintendent
5 = Other

Chi-Square = 13.86 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 34
Relationship Between Gender of Principal and Number of Job Related Moves (Changes in Home Address)

	1	2	3	4	Total
Female	122	19	0	0	141
Male	261	118	43	7	429
Total	383	137	43	7	570

1 = None
2 = 1-2 Moves
3 = 3-5 Moves
4 = Over 5 Moves

Chi-Square = 35.55 on 3 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 35
Relationship Between Gender of Principal and Distance of Current Job From University Where Certification Obtained

	1	2	3	4	Total
Female	75	42	12	9	138
Male	156	116	95	54	421
Total	231	158	107	63	559

1 = Under 50 Miles
2 = 50-99 Miles
3 = 100-249 Miles
4 = 250 Miles or Over

Chi-Square = 21.94 on 3 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 36
Relationship Between Gender of Principal and Position Held Immediately Prior to Current Position as Building Principal

	1	2	3	4	Total
Female	59	14	21	34	128
Male	171	89	21	128	409
Total	230	103	42	162	538

1 = Assistant Principal
2 = Principal in Another Building
3 = Central Office Administrator
4 = Classroom Teacher

Chi-Square = 22.93 on 3 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 37
Relationship Between Gender of Principal and Location of Position Held Immediately Prior to Current Position

	1	2	3	Total
Female	25	100	13	138
Male	68	238	115	421
Total	93	338	128	559

1 = In the same building
2 = In the same district
3 = Outside of the district

Chi-Square = 19.14 on 2 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 38
Relationship Between Gender of Principal and Level of Job Satisfaction

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	79	47	8	4	0	138
Male	159	213	31	7	2	412
Total	238	260	39	11	2	550

1 = Extremely satisfied
2 = Satisfied
3 = Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
4 = Dissatisfied
5 = Extremely dissatisfied

Chi-Square = 16.97 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

APPENDIX E

Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceptions of Sources of Competence to Succeed as a Building Principal

TABLE 39
Relationship Between Campus Enrollment and Perceived Importance of Common Sense as a Source of Competence

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	1	2	8	23	92	126
250-500	4	8	2	41	149	204
501-1000	3	7	1	39	177	227
Over 1000	0	4	1	12	70	87
Total	8	21	12	115	488	644

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 23.34 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 40
Relationship Between Principals' Age and Perceived Importance of Modeling After Other Administrators as a Source of Competence

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 40	2	9	22	73	35	141
40-49	9	25	53	112	70	269
50-59	13	33	45	94	28	213
60 or Over	1	3	7	5	4	20
Total	25	70	127	284	137	643

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 32.37 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 41
Relationship Between Principals' Experience in Current Position and Perceived Importance of Modeling After Other Administrators as a Source of competence

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	4	5	35	68	47	159
3-5 Years	3	16	16	56	23	114
6-10 Years	3	16	22	50	17	108
11-15 Years	4	8	13	32	13	70
Over 15 Years	7	12	25	39	15	98
Total	21	57	111	245	115	649

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Inimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 30.69 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 42
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Perceived Importance of Modeling After Other Administrators as a Source of Competence

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	5	16	22	58	40	141
Male	16	45	97	196	73	427
Total	21	61	119	254	113	565

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 9.95 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

APPENDIX F

Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Perceived Importance of Selected Skills to the Success of any Principal

TABLE 43
Relationship Between Principals' Organizational Level and Perceived Importance of Skill in Instructional Leadership to the Success of Any Principal

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Elementary Prin.	1	1	9	54	310	375
Jr. Hi./Mid. Sch.	1	1	1	37	81	120
High School	0	0	1	40	104	145
Total	2	1	11	131	495	640

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 24.78 on 8 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 44
Relationship Between Principals' Campus Enrollment and Perceived Importance of Interpersonal Relationship Skills to the Success of any Principal

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	1	0	3	44	75	123
250-500	1	0	8	45	146	200
501-1000	0	1	7	37	181	226
Over 1000	1	0	2	13	70	86
Total	3	1	20	139	472	635

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 25.29 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 45
Relationship Between Principals' Campus Enrollment and Perceived Importance of Skill in Teacher Evaluation to the Success of any Principal

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	1	4	18	55	45	123
250-500	1	1	12	74	109	197
501-1000	2	2	6	84	129	223
Over 1000	0	1	7	24	53	85
Total	4	8	43	237	336	628

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 35.11 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 46
Relationship Between Principals' District Enrollment and Perceived Importance of Skill in Budgeting and Finance to the Success of any Principal

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 1000	1	12	31	53	9	106
1000-2500	3	2	9	54	14	82
2500-10,000	0	1	22	76	21	120
10,000 and Over	1	8	37	120	35	201
Total	5	23	99	303	79	609

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 38.19 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 47
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Perceived Importance of Skill in Curriculum Development to the Success of any Principal

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	0	5	15	72	63	155
3-5 Years	0	7	13	54	39	113
6-10 Years	1	2	12	63	25	103
11-15 Years	0	3	10	36	20	69
Over 15 Years	2	1	21	49	23	96
Total	3	18	71	274	170	636

5 = Extremely Important
4 = Important
3 = Unsure
2 = Unimportant
1 = Extremely Unimportant

Chi-Square = 29.58 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

APPENDIX G

Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceived Expertise in Selected Skill Areas

TABLE 48
Relationship Between Principals' Organizational Level and Perceived Expertise in Teacher Evaluation

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Elementary	2	8	27	183	151	371
Jr. Hi./Mid. Sch.	1	4	13	65	34	117
High School	0	2	22	81	39	144
Total	3	14	62	329	224	632

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 17.67 on 8 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 49
Relationship Between Principals' District Enrollment and Perceived Expertise in Campus Leadership

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 1000	0	1	6	67	31	105
1000-2500	0	1	2	37	43	83
2501-10,000	0	0	6	47	68	121
Over 10,000	0	2	11	81	109	203
Total	0	4	25	222	241	512

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 23.41 on 9 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 50
Relationship Between Principals' Campus Enrollment and Their Perceived Expertise in Interpersonal Relations

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	7	17	46	34	14	118
250-500	3	19	56	85	33	196
501-1000	3	11	53	120	37	224
Over 1000	1	5	24	35	20	85
Total	14	52	179	274	104	623

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 39.63 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 51
Relationship Between Principals' District Enrollment and Their Perceived Expertise in Budgeting and Finance

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 1000	4	21	45	22	10	102
1000-2500	5	4	24	38	12	83
2501-10,000	1	7	25	57	29	119
Over 10,000	2	10	53	101	36	202
Total	12	42	147	218	87	506

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 64.21 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 52
Relationship Between Principals' District Enrollment and Their Perceived Expertise in Instructional Leadership

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 1000	1	6	16	63	19	105
1000-2500	1	1	12	46	23	83
2501-10,000	0	3	12	55	50	120
Over 10,000	1	3	14	105	80	203
Total	3	13	54	269	172	511

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 28.14 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 53
Relationship Between Principals' Age and Their Perceived Expertise in Student Management

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 30	0	0	0	3	1	4
30-39	1	3	3	60	97	164
40-49	0	0	13	105	146	264
50-59	2	0	8	103	95	208
60 and Over	0	0	3	6	10	19
Total	3	3	27	277	349	659

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 30.57 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 54
Relationship Between Principals' Age and Their Perceived Expertise in Campus Leadership

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 30	0	0	2	1	1	4
30-39	0	0	8	69	58	135
40-49	0	2	11	112	140	265
50-59	0	1	9	97	103	210
60 and Over	0	1	0	4	13	18
Total	0	4	30	283	315	632

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 34.87 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 55
Relationship Between Principals' Experience in Current and Their Perceived Expertise in Budgeting and Finance

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	4	13	60	59	21	157
3-5 Years	3	13	31	38	26	111
6-10 Years	1	6	22	56	14	99
11-15 Years	2	7	13	36	11	69
16 or More Years	2	4	26	46	18	96
Total	12	43	152	235	90	532

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 27.76 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 56
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Their Perceived Expertise in Budgeting and Finance

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	2	5	23	15	11	56
3-5 Years	2	16	31	45	9	103
6-10 Years	4	15	42	64	31	156
11-15 Years	3	7	35	63	20	128
16 or More Years	3	8	45	87	34	177
Total	14	51	176	274	105	620

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 27.72 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 57
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Their Perceived Expertise in Physical Plant Mangement

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	1	3	14	26	11	55
3-5 Years	0	7	30	59	7	103
6-10 Years	0	8	29	85	35	157
11-15 Years	1	3	27	68	28	127
16 or More Years	4	2	32	93	47	178
Total	6	23	132	331	128	620

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 32.15 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 58
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Their Perceived Expertise in Curriculum Development

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	1	7	17	19	13	57
3-5 Years	1	12	23	52	15	103
6-10 Years	1	13	40	59	44	157
11-15 Years	1	3	40	70	13	127
16 Years and Over	2	9	50	94	22	177
Total	6	44	170	294	107	621

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 39.92 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 59
Relationship Between Principals' Total Experience and Their Perceived Expertise in Staff Development

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 3 Years	1	10	14	24	6	55
3-5 Years	1	4103	27	51	20	
6-10 Years	2	6	42	82	26	158
11-15 years	2	4	37	68	16	127
16 Years and Over	0	8	40	102	28	178
Total	6	32	160	327	96	621

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 28.64 on 16 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 60
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceived Expertise in Curriculum Development

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Females	0	6	25	68	38	137
Males	6	34	130	191	56	417
Total	6	40	155	259	94	554

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 22.93 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 61
Rwelationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceived Expertise in Instructional Leadership

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Females	0	0	5	52	83	140
Males	2	13	47	243	112	417
Total	2	13	52	295	195	557

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 52.01 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 62
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceived Expertise in Teacher Evaluation

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Females	0	0	7	69	62	138
Males	3	6	38	259	112	418
Total	3	6	45	328	174	556

5 = Very Strong
4 = Strong
3 = Unsure
2 = Weak
1 = Very Weak

Chi-Square = 18.46 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

APPENDIX H

Relationships Between Demographic Variables and Principals' Perceptions of Their University Administration Program

TABLE 63
Relationship Between Principals' Campus Enrollment and Their Perceptions of University Preparation in Teacher Evaluation

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	27	36	30	23	3	119
250-500	57	38	53	37	7	192
501-1000	55	77	52	29	5	218
Over 1000	15	26	31	10	3	85
Total	154	177	166	99	18	614

5 = Well Prepared
4 = Prepared
3 = Unsure
2 = Incompletely Prepared
1 = No preparation

Chi-Square = 21.18 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 63
Relationship Between Principals' Campus Enrollment and Their Perceptions of University Preparation in Student Management

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Under 250	13	32	37	32	6	120
250-500	37	28	46	69	17	197
501-1000	33	50	62	61	11	217
Over 1000	13	28	21	16	7	85
Total	96	138	166	178	41	619

5 = Well Prepared
4 = Prepared
3 = Unsure
2 = Incompletely Prepared
1 = No Preparation

Chi-Square = 24.86 on 12 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 64
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceptions of University Preparation in Interpersonal Relations

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	26	11	42	48	10	137
Male	30	80	154	125	26	415
Total	56	91	196	173	36	552

5 = Well Prepared
4 = Prepared
3 = Unsure
2 = Incompletely Prepared
1 = No Preparation

Chi-Square = 24.09 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 65
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceptions of University Preparation in Campus Leadership

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	5	24	35	55	19	138
Male	24	63	133	172	24	416
Total	29	87	168	227	43	554

5 = Well Prepared
4 = Prepared
3 = Unsure
2 = Incompletely Prepared
1 = No Preparation

Chi-Square = 11.34 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 66
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceptions of University Preparation in Physical Plant Management

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	30	34	40	29	4	137
Male	49	92	146	111	15	413
Total	79	126	186	140	19	550

5 = Well Prepared
4 = Prepared
3 = Unsure
2 = Incompletely Prepared
1 = No Preparation

Chi-Square = 10.12 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 67
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceptions of University Preparation in Instructional Leadership

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	5	21	34	53	26	139
Male	24	80	137	150	25	416
Total	29	101	171	203	51	555

5 = Well Prepared
4 = Prepared
3 = Unsure
2 = Incompletely Prepared
1 = No Preparation

Chi-Square = 22.74 on 4 df ($p < 0.05$)

TABLE 68
Relationship Between Principals' Gender and Their Perceptions of University Preparation in Leadership for Staff Development

	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Female	17	24	48	41	7	137
Male	44	95	183	85	8	415
Total	61	119	231	126	15	552

5 = Well Prepared
4 = Prepared
3 = Unsure
2 = Incompletely Prepared
1 = No Preparation